

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.		
10/649,006	08/26/2003	Sai-Mun Lee	70011377-2	5926		
7:	7590 10/28/2005			EXAMINER		
AGILENT TECHNOLOGIES, INC.			NADAV, ORI			
Legal Department, DL429			Laminum I	DARED MUNICIPAL		
Intellectual Property Administration			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
P.O. Box 7599			2811			
Loveland, CO 80537-0599			DATE MAILED: 10/28/2005			

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/649,006	LEE ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
Ori Nadav	2811	

Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Ori Nadav	2811				
The MAILING DATE of this communication app	ears on the cover sheet w	ith the correspondence as	idross			
THE REPLY FILED 19 October 2005 FAILS TO PLACE THIS			101 e33			
 The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or of this application, applicant must timely file one of the foll places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a N (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in comfollowing time periods: 	on the same day as filing a lowing replies: (1) an amend Notice of Appeal (with appea pliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	Notice of Appeal. To avoid dment, affidavit, or other evi al fee) in compliance with 37	idence, which 7 CFR 41.31; or			
a) The period for reply expires 3_months from the mailing date of the final rejection. b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no						
event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO						
MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened s above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three month earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL 2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in com-	n which the petition under 37 CF and the corresponding amount of statutory period for reply originally hs after the mailing date of the fi	of the fee. The appropriate extensions at in the final Office action; or (and rejection, even if timely filed, respectively).	sion fee under 37 (2) as set forth in (b) may reduce any			
of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must AMENDMENTS	extension thereof (37 CFR	41.37(e)), to avoid dismissa	I of the appeal.			
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below); (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);						
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or (d) They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.						
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)		many rejected elamis.				
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324). 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): 6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling						
the non-allowable claim(s).						
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a how the new or amended claims would be rejected is proposed. The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:		b) □ Will be entered and a	n explanation of			
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE						
8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, I because applicant failed to provide a showing of good a and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).						
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filin entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessa The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation 	overcome <u>all</u> rejections und ary and was not earlier pres	der appeal and/or appellant ented. See 37 CFR 41.33(o	fails to provide a 1)(1).			
REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER		·				
 The request for reconsideration has been considered b <u>See attachment.</u> 	out does NOT place the app	ilication in condition for allow	vance because:			
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) 13. Other:). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449	0) Paper No(s)	1			
		ORI NADAV PRIMARY EXAM				

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

Applicant argues that the title corresponds to the scope of the currently pending claims, and is therefore descriptive of that which is claimed, and if the examiner would prefer a different title, applicants request that the examiner make a suggestion.

Applicant's title corresponds to any packaging structure and does not necessarily cover the scope of the currently pending claims, and is therefore not descriptive of that which is claimed. An example of an adequate title is "packaging structure having hollow substrate with a recess therein".

Applicant argues that the examiner's indication that the Information Disclosure Statement (IDS) filed on 7/2/2004 fails to comply with 37 CFR 1.98(a)(2) and, as a result, the IDS filed on 7/2/2004 has not been considered contradicts the action of the examiner who was previously assigned to this case, who initialed applicants' Form PT0-1449 on 10/7/2004 to indicate that the references submitted as part of the 7/2/2004 IDS had been considered.

The examiner's indication that the Information Disclosure Statement (IDS) filed on 7/2/2004 fails to comply with 37 CFR 1.98(a)(2) and, as a result, the IDS filed on 7/2/2004 has not been considered does not contradict the action of the examiner who was previously assigned to this case, who initialed applicants' Form PT0-1449 on 10/7/2004 to indicate that the references submitted as part of the 7/2/2004 IDS had been considered. It is possible that, at the time the previous examiner considered the

IDS filed on 7/2/2004, legible copy of each cited foreign patent document was present in the case. At this time, none of the copies of the cited foreign patent document is present in the case.

Applicant argues that there is support in the specification for a hollow extending from the first side of the substrate to the second side of the substrate, as recited in claim 1, because the specification recites "The hollow within the substrate is made up of a first recess 42, in the first major side 44 and a second recess 48 in the second major side 46 (the underside in the orientation of Figure 2), meeting within the substrate".

The examiner agrees that the specification recites a hollow within the substrate is made up of a first recess and a second recess. However, there is no support in the specification for a hollow [first recess and second recess] extending from the first side of the substrate to the second side of the substrate, as recited in claim 1, because claim 1 already recites a recess [second recess] in the second side of the substrate.

Applicant argues that Nicewarner does not teach a "hollow 22 extending from the first side of the substrate 12 to the second side of the substrate", because the two cavities 18 and 20 of Nicewarner are separated by a partition 21 that is part of substrate 12.

The examiner does not consider cavity 20 as part of the "hollow". Only cavity 18 is considered as part of the "hollow". The second side of substrate 12 is taken to be the lower surface of the layer having sidewalls 60 and 64, and not surface 52. Partition 21

Art Unit: 2811

is therefore located below the second side of the "considered substrate 12". Therefore, Nicewarner teaches a "hollow 22 extending from the first side of the substrate 12 to the second side of the substrate", as claimed.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ori Nadav whose telephone number is 571-272-1660. The examiner can normally be reached between the hours of 7 AM to 4 PM (Eastern Standard Time) Monday through Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen Loke can be reached on 571-272-1657. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Art Unit: 2811

O.N. 10/24/05 ORI NADAV PRIMARY EXAMINER TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800